Colonel Chambers's sugestion that Ryan "might find some place nearby for his work," and demands "in view of all the circumstances, where?" (2). He concludes that "in this respect, at least, the Dominion Army Medical Service has failed to appreciate the importance of affording facilities for the prompt treatment of the mentally affected Canadian solder" (2).

Ryan seems to have got his way. In his letter to the Provincial Secretary of June 4, 1916, he reports ongoing friction with Colonel Chambers, who still insits that the mental wards "must be under him as part of medicine" (2). He contrasts his enemy with Achilles, who was "vulnerable in the heel .... Chambers is vulnerable in the head" (2). See the Archives of Ontario, Provincial Secretary's Correspondence, RG 8-5, Hon. W.J. Hanna Files (1905-1916) and W.D. McPherson Files (1916-1919). For background see Thomas Edward Brown, "Shell shock in the Canadian Expeditionary Force, 1914-1918: Canadian Psychiatry in the Great War" in Health, Disease and Medicine: Essays in Canadian History, ed. Charles G. Roland (Toronto: Hannah Insititute, 1984), 308-332.

The newspapers continued to report cases of shell shock into the 1920s. One such article, in the Toronto Star of June 18, 1927, was headed "War Hurts Drive Man Crazy; Wife Destitute and Alone," exploits the negative reputation of the Asylum as a place of imprisonment, and the Gothic imagery of its "gloomy and relentless walls on Queen street," as a foil for the "spotlessly clean .... little house on St. David's street" that the patient has been deprived of by being comitted.

The man had been a good worker, had received a gunshot wound over his right eye, and been awarded the D.C.M. On resuming his old job at Massey's he had suffered periodic bouts of "mental trouble" and finally been unable to work. He had been examined at the General Hospital and removed "to the confines of 999 Queen street west." The application for aid on his behalf had been turned down by the "Ottawa authorities." Now his wife was destitute. His case is seen as typical:

> one of these most unfortuante of men who after arduous service and an A1 discharge reap in after years the harvest of the insidious seed that was unquestionably planted in the days of active service. "Post-war origin," is the cry of the authorities ....

The weekly visit of the patient's wife to the Asylum is "the most pitiful pilgrimage of all time." Her interview with her husband is "a tragedy that would break the barriers of cold indifference in the heart of the most callous." The patient calls tells his wife "You are my lady," and she replies "No, I am your wife." He gives her buttons or other trinkets, unaware that he is "at the centre of a ghastly calamity" and "living the life of the living dead."

[cxxi] "(Report of the) First Annual Meeting of the Canadian National Committee for Mental Hygiene," Canadian Journal of Mental Hygiene 2 (1920), 172-81.

[cxxii] C.K. Clarke, "Mental Hygiene in Canada," The Lancet 1 (June, 1923): 1139-41.

[cxxiii] According to Thomas Edward Brown, "Living with God's Afflicted": A History of the Provincial Lunatic Asylum at Toronto (Queen's University, Kingston: Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, 1981), during the inter-war period Canadian psychiatrists expanded their jurisdiction, "invading the precincts of the court, the prison, the school, the factory and even the home" (374). That the war actually facilitated such expansion is apparent in these texts.

[cxxiv] While my view of Clarke and his clinics is negative if not cynical, it is not inconsistent with Brown's view in Living with God's Afflicted that "Clarke's campaign to keep Ontario in the forefront of the `new psychiatry,' by shifting the attention of both asylum officials and politicians away from the problems of the asylums to the promise of the psychiatric clinic, had the unintended consequence of perpetuating, and in some ways, justifying the abuses, deficiencies, indeed, the very system of institutions that Clarke was attempting to reform" (370). In some ways my version of Clarke resembles the "progressive" of David Rothman's Conscience and Convenience: The Asylum and Its Alternatives in Progressive America (Boston: Little, Brown, 1980), with the importance difference that Clarke's intentions, so far as they can be told from his texts, are never simple, least of all in their "benevolence." Perhaps because of his pivotal role in the history of asylums, Clarke encapsulates (or